

REMARKS

The Title of the Invention has been amended. The Specification has been amended. Claims 2-6, and 8-10 have been amended. Claim 1 has been
5 cancelled. Claims 2-40 remain in the application. Further examination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is hereby requested.

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Title as being non-descriptive. Applicants have amended the Title to make it more
10 descriptive of at least one aspect of Applicant's invention.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract because the Abstract is too short. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. In particular, the Examiner states that the Abstract should be in the range of 50 to
15 150 words. 37 CFR 1.72(b) states that the "abstract in an application filed under 35 USC 111 may not exceed 150 words in length." The federal rules do not state that the Abstract must be longer than 50 words which the Examiner suggests. Accordingly the Applicants have declined to amend the Abstract. Withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

20 In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure due to informalities.

In one particular informality, the Examiner objected that the "Brief of the Summary of the Invention" was missing. Applicants respectfully traverse this
25 objection. According to 37 CFR 1.73, the Summary "*should* precede the detailed description" and "*when set forth*" be commensurate with the invention as claimed. "Should" and "when set forth" imply that the Summary is not required but if it is then it is to be commensurate with the invention as claimed. Accordingly, the Applicants have declined to amend the specification to add a Summary.

30 In another particular informality, the Examiner objected in that the spec in page 3, para[16] "A alab-on-chip@" is incorrect and should be corrected. Applicants have amended the specification to correct accordingly and also searched the specification for further occurrences. The Applicants have also corrected a similar mistake in para[31].

35 Withdrawal of the objections of the Specification is respectfully requested.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakajima et al. Applicants have cancelled claim 1. In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner objected to claims 2-8 which the Applicants believe is due to their dependency on claim 1. Claims 2-6, and 8-10 which depended directly on claim 1 have been amended to place in independent format. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 2-10 are patentable over the art made of record and their allowance is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicated that claims 9-40 were allowed. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of these claims.

Applicants believe their claims as amended are patentable over the art of record, and that the amendments made herein are within the scope of a search properly conducted under the provisions of MPEP 904.02. Accordingly, claims 2-40 are deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the Application other than in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should such fees be associated with an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this paper be considered a petition therefore.

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541)715-4197
Fax: (541)715-8581

Respectfully Submitted,

Ronald Hollekson et al.

By: 

Timothy F. Myers

Patent Attorney

Registration No. 42,919